



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion," "the most abject copy conceivable of a pernicious foreign idea," "a delusion than which a more complete can not be imagined." "What other powerful nation has dispensed with a standing army? What other nation with an immense seaboard has maintained but an insignificant fleet? It has been our glory to be safe, though without fortresses, fleets or armies."

We believe Sumner would have called these sentences a most consummate practical statement of his argument, and that he would have recognized his own voice in the following magnificent passage from the same speech of President Eliot:

"Now, Gentlemen, I, too, believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission; but it is not that one (of armed force). It is not by force of arms that we may best commend to the peoples of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government; but rather by taking millions from various peoples into our own land, and here giving them experience of the advantages of freedom. . . . There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example—by giving persuasive example of happiness and prosperity, arrived at through living in freedom and at peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or land. Never should we attempt to force another nation to adopt arbitration or *any other doctrine of peace.*"

### The Czar's Note.

The note, given in full on page 191, which the Czar of Russia, on the 24th of August, through his foreign minister, handed to the representatives at St. Petersburg of the European powers, calling for a conference in the interests of a reduction of armaments and of peace, will, if it proves to be meant seriously, stand as one of the most important state documents issued during this century. The note was unexpected, and has produced a profound impression in Europe. Various motives have been assigned for the issuing of the call for a conference at the present time, but the note itself bears evidence that the motives there given are the real ones which determined the Czar's course. His reasons for desiring a reduction of armaments are the same as those put forth by the friends of peace for many years, namely, that the constant increase of armaments tends to insecurity instead of peace, that they are a crushing load on the people and that they prevent the development of those interests on which human welfare everywhere depends.

The note has met with a favorable reception nearly everywhere in Europe, though of course there have been cynical slurs and imputation of bad motives. The difficulties in the way of such a conference are pointed out particularly in France, but the purpose

of Emperor Nicholas is in general highly praised. It is thought that the governments of other European nations knew of the Czar's intention, and that therefore the conference is sure to meet. The large approval given by the European press will make it much easier to secure the consent of the governments to the holding of the conference. It is recognized in all intelligent quarters in Europe that the mad rivalry in armaments must before long cease, either through the awful cataclysm which the Czar points out or through some peaceful agreement of the powers. The hour has come for the beginning of disarmament. The authoritative voice in its behalf has been heard none too soon. One trembles to think what may happen in Europe in the near future if the Czar's purpose should fail of realization. The conference, it seems to us, will be held because it must be held, if ruin, widespread and fearful, is to be averted.

All good men everywhere will watch with the greatest interest the developments which the Czar's move brings about. It may be, we can not help believing that it is, the beginning of one of the grandest and most beneficent movements which history has ever recorded.

### Editorial Notes.

On Tuesday, July 26th, the French ambassador, M. Jules Cambon, presented to President McKinley a message from the Spanish government looking to the end of the war. On Saturday following the President, after much consultation with his cabinet and a further conference with M. Cambon, communicated his reply to the Spanish overtures, stating the terms of peace acceptable to the United States. On August 6th, the Spanish Cabinet formulated its reply to the President's terms, which were virtually accepted. After approval by the Queen Regent the reply was sent by way of Paris to Washington, where it was received on the 8th and communicated to the President on the 9th. On the 10th, the peace protocol prepared by Secretary Day was approved by the French Ambassador and forwarded to Madrid. On the 11th the Spanish Cabinet instructed Ambassador Cambon to sign the protocol, and the President cabled to the generals of the army and navy to suspend all hostilities. On the 12th at twenty-three minutes past 4 o'clock the protocol was signed by Ambassador Cambon and Secretary Day, and the war was virtually ended. The ceremony of signing the protocol in the cabinet room at the White House, with President McKinley sitting at the head of the table, was simple but impressive. Out of courtesy the copy intended for Spain was signed first. After the signatures were affixed all present joined in congratulations over the beneficent attainment. Final word was then sent to the army and the navy that hostilities should cease.

According to the official statement given out by the Secretary of State, the protocol provides :

That Spain will relinquish all claim of sovereignty and title to Cuba.

That Porto Rico and the other Spanish islands in the West Indies and an island in the Ladrones, to be selected by the United States, shall be ceded to this country.

That the United States will occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines.

That Cuba, Porto Rico and the other Spanish Islands in the West Indies shall be immediately evacuated, and that commissioners, to be appointed within ten days, shall, within thirty days from the signing of the protocol, meet at Havana and San Juan, respectively, to arrange and execute the details of the evacuation.

That the United States and Spain will appoint each not more than five commissioners to negotiate and conclude a treaty of peace. The commissioners are to meet at Paris not later than the first of October.

On the signing of the protocol hostilities will be suspended, and notice to that effect will be given as soon as possible by each government to the commanders of its military force.

The five United States commissioners provided for in the protocol have been named by the President. They are Secretary of State Day, Senator C. K. Davis, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Senator W. P. Frye, Justice E. D. White, and Hon. Whitelaw Reid. This is an able body of commissioners, but what earthly use will they find for their talents? They are to go to Paris instructed by the President exactly what to do. Everything except the matter of the Philippines is decided in advance, and on that subject the commissioners are to go with an ultimatum in their hands, listen to arguments by the Spanish commissioners, and then force the acceptance of the ultimatum. The whole matter of the commission seems to be a case of "much ado about nothing." Why did not the President through his Secretary of State adjust the whole matter without all this useless machinery and the spending of \$200,000 on it? A little change in the protocol would have made the thing easy. But war, we suppose, whether it is formally declared or not, must be formally ended by a long and circuitous method, simply because things have always been done in that way. That is the way the war nations have always proceeded, and their methods, now more in vogue in this country than formerly, must be followed in this case out of courtesy, we presume, to Spain. The pretense of submitting the question as to what shall be done with the Philippines to a joint commission, when it is perfectly understood beforehand that the Spanish commissioners will have no voice whatever in the decision, is a huge farce wholly unworthy of the United States government. The commission which is to sit at Paris, if it were an honest thing, would have the whole question in its hands without previous instructions, and Spain would then have some show of frank treatment. The

commission is to depart about the middle of September, and is expected to finish its work in time for the President to make mention in his Thanksgiving proclamation of the signing of the treaty of peace.

The national conference held at Saratoga on the 19th and 20th of August to discuss the future foreign policy of the United States was attended by more than five hundred persons from different parts of the country. One session was devoted to the subject of the Nicaragua Canal. But this awakened little interest compared with that of territorial expansion. The principal speakers were Henry Wade Rogers, Warner Miller, Carl Schurz, Judge P. S. Grosscup, William Dudley Foulke, Congressman F. H. Gillett of Mass., Moorfield Storey, Samuel Gompers, P. W. Meldrum of Savannah, Dr. W. P. Wilson of Philadelphia. Robert Treat Paine, President of the American Peace Society, presided at one of the sessions, and in a brief speech opposed the expansionist idea. The other principal opponents of expansion were Carl Schurz, Moorfield Storey and Mr. Samuel Gompers, and judging from the reports which we have seen of the addresses much the best speaking in the conference was done by them. The chief advocates of expansion were Judge Grosscup, David Dudley Foulke, Major Meldrum and Dr. Wilson. Congressman Gillett made an admirable speech on the "Immorality of Prize Money." Henry Wade Rogers, who presided at the opening session, strongly urged permanent arbitration between the United States and Great Britain as a long step towards universal peace. The resolutions on the whole seem to express the position of the anti-expansionist, though they contain a big loophole for expansion. The resolutions, so far as they bear upon the subject for which the conference was called are as follows :

"We believe that the rescued and liberated people of the surrendered islands are in a sense temporarily the wards of the conquering nation, and that we should treat them as such.

With our views of the natural rights and of the inestimable privileges of civil liberty, we should not be justified in returning the conquered islands to the misrule and oppression from which we have relieved them. As soon as the islands under our present protection can be trusted to govern themselves they should be allowed to do so, the United States retaining under its authority necessary naval stations. Until such time as they may be able to govern themselves they should continue under the protection of the United States, and the question as to whether, at some future period, and at the mutual desire of both, they should be permanently annexed should be left to the time when it arises.

The United States on behalf of each of the territories in question, and so long as it shall continue under our protection, should adopt proper measures for securing out of the revenues of these countries the establishment of free, elementary, unsectarian schools, sufficient for the instruction of all persons of school age.

We count the present an auspicious time for the estab-

lishment by the United States of a graded diplomatic and consular service.

We heartily approve of the principle of arbitration in the settlement of international differences, and urge that its largest practicable application be secured by treaties of arbitration.

We cordially favor the precedent set by President McKinley in refusing at the beginning of the war to grant letters of marque and reprisal, and we recommend that in the peace to be concluded between the United States and Spain, the practice of privateering be forever prohibited; also, that provision be made, as foreshadowed by the government of the United States in refusing to sign the declaration of Paris of 1856, for the exemption from capture of private property at sea, in accordance with the most enlightened sentiment of mankind."

In an able article in the *Boston Herald* for July 29th, Mr. Moorfield Storey argues, it seems to us conclusively, against the proposition to take Porto Rico and annex it, through what has been called the right of conquest. No such right exists in a government which is based upon the two propositions that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and that "taxation without representation is tyranny." There is no way in which the imposing of our government upon the Porto Ricans can be reconciled with the fundamental principles of our political system. To annex Porto Rico in this way is a violation of the solemn declaration made by the government at the outbreak of the war with Spain. "To say that we meant only Cuba, and no other territory of Spain, is to construe a great public declaration as if it were a criminal indictment. It is to put this country in the position of deliberately trying to deceive." "The man does not live who can explain why Cuba ought to be free and independent and Porto Rico deprived of independence." "To take Porto Rico in lieu of indemnity is the least defensible position of all." "Granted that we in a case like this can afford to exact indemnity, which I do not admit, who owes it to us? Clearly Spain." Mr. Storey further argues that if we take Porto Rico, not by the will of its citizens, but by grant of Spain, we are taking title from a country which we have already declared has lost its title by misrule. There is only one other course left. If we take a plebiscite and admit the inhabitants of Porto Rico by their own vote, then we must, if consistent with our principles, give them representation.

Against this Mr. Storey protests on the ground of the unfitness of Porto Rico to become a state and to assist in governing us. With all these positions we heartily agree. But if Porto Rico is to be taken in at all, every citizen of the nation ought to protest against its coming in any other way than by a vote of its people. However troublesome Porto Rican Representatives might be in Washington, or in the capital of Florida if the island

should be made a part of that state, much less mischief would be done in this way than by annexation by conquest, which is both immoral and un-American.

The Peace Societies in Great Britain are circulating the following memorial for signatures. The occasion of it, which is a very serious one, is the program of the Admiralty to build, at the cost of seventy-five million dollars, four new battleships, six powerful cruisers and a dozen torpedo destroyers, to match those which Russia has begun to build:

"THE MEMORIAL OF THE UNDERSIGNED SHOWETH:

Your lordship's Memorialists are gravely alarmed by the tone and substance of the declaration of policy made by the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, M.P., in the House of Commons on Friday, July 22, 1898. It seems to your Memorialists that any addition to our already enormous armament is greatly to be deplored whether as regards its effects upon domestic or upon external policy; but a naval programme directly and publicly aimed at a Power with which we maintain amicable relations is unprecedented and far more perilous. Your Memorialists deeply regret a statement which cannot but be regarded in Russia as a challenge, a menace and a provocation, and which must have added much to the ill-feeling already unfortunately rife. They also venture to raise a protest against the official adoption of the doctrine of retaliation and competition in armaments which makes our expenditure and our policy dependent purely upon the action of foreign countries, whether our territory and trade be threatened or not. They believe that the relative position of the British Navy will be weakened rather than strengthened by these aggressive proceedings. As a free and constitutional nation we must stand or fall by our policy; an overwhelming navy settles nothing permanently. The hope for the continued safety and prosperity of this country lies not in any appeal to brute force but in the steady pursuits of the peaceful arts and industries, in a conciliatory statesmanship, and in the extended practice of international consultation. Your Memorialists would therefore respectfully suggest that until an attempt has been made by conference to settle peacefully the rival claims to spheres of influence in China, and until diplomatic tentatives for a general truce of armaments have been made, and have failed, there can be no moral or political justification for further warlike threats and preparations. They therefore pray that your lordship will take an early opportunity of again publicly expressing the goodwill of the British people toward the peoples of Europe, and of your desire to accomplish a peaceful settlement of outstanding difficulties."

The London Peace Society, in response to an invitation accorded to its Secretary, Dr. W. Evans Darby, addressed the following letter to the Arbitration Conference, which met in June at Lake Mohonk. The letter did not arrive until after the close of the Conference:

Dear Colleagues,—The Committee of the Peace Society cordially greet you in your Annual Assembly and send our hearty good wishes for your Meetings and the success of your work.

We have received with satisfaction the reports of your proceedings each year, have followed with interest your discussions, and have felt that you were doing a good work in disseminating rational ideas concerning international relations, in educating society, and in preparing the way for a better era in international affairs.

We sympathize with you in the circumstances under which you meet this year. We regret this war; we regret the outburst of Jingoism which brought it about, and the condition of things in unhappy Cuba, which incited that outburst; and, most of all, we regret the departure of your great nation from the unique — we had almost said the proud — pacific position she has hitherto held, and her entrance on the perilous paths of military and naval rivalry, which can only bring misery and a surrender of high ideals to her own people, and intensify the miseries already existing among other nations.

At the same time we appreciate greatly the noble stand which many of you have made against the Jingo spirit, and the strenuous efforts you have put forth to induce the Government to follow better counsels than that of the politician and the mob.

We hope you will not be discouraged. You have failed to secure a hearing, that is all. The cause remains the same. The failure is one of effort only, not of principle, or even of method. That can be covered by fresh effort, and to that we pledge you anew. It is possible that this war may prepare the way to redeem our previous failure to secure the adoption of a permanent Treaty of Arbitration between the two countries, which would have been a first step in the organization of International Arbitration as the arbitrament of nations instead of war.

An Anglo-American Alliance for such an object, and for the introduction of an International régime of righteousness and peace, would be a grand achievement. It seems that we are nearer that than we were, that we are nearer it because of the momentary defeat. So let us gird ourselves anew to the work and join hands across the sea for the promotion of brotherhood, amity and concord.

---

There has been some difficulty between Italy and the United States of Colombia over the matter of the settlement of the Cerutti claim. The 2d of March, 1897, President Cleveland, to whom the case had been submitted, decided that Colombia should pay to Italy an indemnity of 1,500,000 francs, and also pay all the creditors of Cerutti. The Colombian government paid the former, but for a time declined to pay the latter, and in consequence the Italian government sent Admiral Candiani to Cartagena to enforce payment. The latest reports are that through the good offices of the British, French and German ministers the Colombian Congress has voted the necessary amount and authorized President Caro to settle the claim in full.

---

In the *American Monthly Review of Reviews* for August, Sylvester Baxter writes thus of the Spanish National character:

"The view that regards the Spanish as a decadent and degenerate people is a most mistaken one. Granting the severest things that can be said of the national organization of Spain and its dire results for a great part of the world, the national character is something quite different.

The valiant spirit, heroic and self-sacrificing, that enabled Spain to turn Napoleon's path from the heights of victorious renown down toward the depths of defeat, is by no means dead. It has, indeed, followed evil guidance in support of false pride, in the vain endeavor to hold what by right had been forfeited. It has paid the cost with well-nigh half a million lives and with treasure that might have lifted the land out of its poverty.

The intellectual power of the nation that gave to the world Cervantes and the great dramatists still persists. In contemporary literature the masters of Spanish fiction stand the peers of their contemporaries in all other lands. They have made the beautiful Castilian tongue a plastic vehicle for modern thought, and in sagacity, humor, breadth of vision, sanity of temperament, and humane spirit they are rightful heirs to the mantle of Cervantes. With so large a proportion of their countrymen illiterate and penniless, their pens have had little of the sordid in their incentive, and their single-minded following of high ideals has not been less than that which inspired the writing of "Don Quixote."

The peasantry of Spain is marked by admirable traits. These poor and sturdy people are frugal, industrious, temperate, patient under heavy burdens, ground down by a crude and extortionate fiscal system, and doomed to grievous toil. Once let enlightenment and freedom come to them, and Spain will stand redeemed among nations."

---

The 32d annual convention of the Universal Peace Union of Philadelphia was held in the Peace Temple, at Mystic, Conn., on the 24th, 25th and 26th of August. The crowds which gathered in the grove were large as usual. A number of letters were read from prominent persons who had been invited to be present. Alfred H. Love, who was reelected president of the Union, made a personal statement in reference to the much discussed letter to the Queen of Spain and the removal of the Union from Independence Hall on account of it. Addresses were made by Hon. John W. Hoyt, Professor Daniel Bachellor, Dr. Agnes Kemp, Mrs. Amanda Deyo, William Lloyd Garrison, and others. Mr. Garrison's address, which was a strong one, we hope to publish in full. A cablegram of congratulation from the Austrian Peace Society was received and a letter of greeting from the Secretary of the London Peace Society. Resolutions were passed declaring strongly against the unreasonableness and inhumanity of war and the national insanity accompanying it.

### Brevities.

We publish in this issue a number more of the speeches made at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference in June. The stenographic report of the proceedings of the Conference has been published. A copy may be had by addressing Albert K. Smiley, Lake Mohonk, Ulster Co., N. Y., and enclosing five cents to cover postage.

. . . Great Britain and Russia have agreed to submit to arbitration the question of the indemnity due to Great Britain from Russia for alleged illegal seizure of Canadian sealing vessels in Russian waters. Alphonse Rivier, professor of international law in Brussels University, who was appointed arbitrator in the case, has since died.